

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

DATE OF CONFERENCES: March 12, 2020

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

Phil Brogan
John Butler
Sheila Charles
Ron Crickard
Loretta Doughty
Meli Dube
Jill Edelmann
Bob Juliano
Ron Kleiner
Marc Laurin
Rebecca Martin
Mike Mozer
Jennifer Reczek
David Scott

FHWA

Jamie Sikora (via phone)

NHDHR

Laura Black
David Trubey

ACOE

Richard Kristoff

FHI

Jill Barrett (via phone)

HDR

James Murphy
John Stockton

HEB

Chris Fournier
Jay Poulin

Jacobs

Steve Halloran
Zachary Zavalianos

Preservation Company

Lynne Monroe

Consulting Parties

Gary Bashline
Kate Bashline
Kitty Henderson

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

| | |
|---|---|
| Seabrook-Hampton 15904, X-A001(026) | 1 |
| Troy 40370 (non-federal)..... | 4 |
| Troy 40371, X-A004(374)..... | 6 |
| Laconia 40656..... | 8 |

Seabrook-Hampton 15904, X-A001(026)

Participants: Jill Barrett, FHI; James Murphy, John Stockton, HDR; John Butler, Bob Juliano, Marc Laurin, Jennifer Reczek, David Scott, NHDOT; Kate and Gary Bashline, Kitty Henderson, Betty Moore (via phone), Consulting Parties

Continued consultation on the NHRT 1A over Hampton River (Neil R. Underwood Memorial Bridge) project, discussion of alternatives analysis and presentation of possible mitigation opportunities.

The third coordination meeting with New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) and Consulting Parties on the Hampton Harbor Bridge Project was held on March 12, 2020 at the offices of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT). Jim Murphy, HDR’s Project Manager, began the presentation by stating that the project team had completed the Type, Size and Location Study (TS&L). They are now sharing the findings with review agencies, including NHDHR. He ran through the agenda for the

meeting which included an update on project status, finalizing the Effects Tables, a review of the TS&L findings, an initial discussion of mitigation, and next steps.

He said the project team last met with NHDHR and Consulting Parties in February of 2019. Since the outset of the project, they've completed Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment and a Phase 1B Study of the wooden piles on the south side of the bridge. In addition, they've completed eight Individual Inventory Forms and one District Area Form. Four historic properties were identified within the Area of Potential Effects (APE), including the Neil R. Underwood Memorial Bridge, the Eastern Railroad Historic District, the Hampton Beach Cottages Historic District, and 197 Ashworth Avenue. The New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) determined 54 River Street and 266 Portsmouth Avenue to be ineligible but NHDHR disagreed with this finding, however neither of these properties would be affected by the project. He said each of the alternatives would result in an adverse effect to the National Register-eligible Neil R. Underwood Memorial Bridge. The project team has submitted Effects Tables to NHDHR for their review, revised the tables to address comments and resubmitted the tables to NHDHR. Laura Black with NHDHR said she had additional comments on the Effects Table for the Neil R. Underwood Memorial Bridge. She then outlined the necessary revisions. Jill Edelman with NHDOT said the project team would make the changes and resubmit the tables.

Jennifer Reczek, NHDOT's Project Manager, then reviewed the status of the design. She said the project team completed an assessment of the condition of the bridge in the summer/fall of 2018. A Traffic Study and an Alignment and Profile Study were also completed in the fall of 2018. This was followed by a Rehabilitation Study and most recently the Type, Size and Location Study. Ms. Reczek said the purpose of the project is to provide a safe, reliable and structurally sound crossing and that it's necessary because the bridge is structurally deficient and functionally obsolete.

Ms. Reczek then discussed the four alternatives considered by NHDOT. She said each alternative meets the project purpose and need. The Rehabilitation (With Widened Bridge) Alternative would widen the roadway to 50 feet, necessitating the widening of the piers. The widening would be undertaken on the east side so the operator's house could be maintained. The bridge's superstructure would be entirely replaced. Ms. Reczek said there would be no improvement to the vertical navigational clearance under the bridge and that this alternative would require a temporary bridge. The life cycle cost would be \$93 million.

The Twin Bridge (With Rehabilitated Bridge) Alternative would construct a new bascule bridge west of the existing bridge. The existing bridge would carry northbound traffic and the new bridge would carry southbound traffic. Each bridge would have a six-foot sidewalk, an eight-foot shoulder and an 11-foot travel way. This alternative would not improve navigation, but instead would impede passage under the bridge because the length of the restricted channel would be increased. There could also be impacts to the navigational channel within Hampton Harbor which would require blasting. This alternative would maintain the existing operator's house, but the bridge's superstructure would be replaced. At \$139 million, this would be the most expensive of the four alternatives.

Ms. Reczek said the Replacement with Bascule Bridge Alternative would construct a new bascule bridge west of the existing bridge, and then the existing bridge would be demolished. The height of the new bridge would be 34 feet and the width of the navigational channel at the bridge would be increased to 80 feet, improving navigation. However, there could be impacts to the navigational channel within Hampton Harbor which would require blasting, and there would be traffic delays when the bridge is in the open position. Ms. Reczek said the lifecycle cost for this alternative would be \$125 million.

The Replacement with Fixed Bridge Alternative would have the lowest life cycle costs (\$72 million), the shortest construction duration, and would avoid impacts to the navigational channel in Hampton Harbor. The navigational channel under the bridge would be widened to 150' and there would be fewer obstructions for small vessels. The underclearance would be 48' which would accommodate all known vessels that access

Hampton Harbor. It would also accommodate the USACE dredge vessel, the *Currituck*. Ms. Reczek said that NHDOT and FHWA had identified the Replacement with Fixed Bridge as the anticipated Preferred Alternative. Mr. Murphy said the Public Advisory Committee had generally been supportive of the Fixed Bridge Alternative. Dave Trubey with NHDHR asked whether the design would accommodate sea level rise. Ms. Reczek said the design accommodates sea level rise of 3.9 feet by 2100.

Betty Moore asked about the concrete fixed bridge alternative and what the impacts would be when the approaches are widened. Jim Murphy, the Project Engineer, said there would be impacts to the dune habitat southwest of the bridge, but only minor impacts on the southeast side due to grading. There would be no impacts to the homes southeast of the bridge. Northeast of the bridge the parking lots for the fishing and tour boats would be impacted. Any impacts to the Hampton Beach State Park and the campground area would be minimal.

Ms. Reczek then compared the four alternatives. She said each would result in an adverse effect to the bridge under Section 106, and each would have a construction duration of three to four years. She said the Fixed Bridge is the only alternative that would not result in traffic delays during operation.

Mr. Murphy said the project team would send the TS&L and the Effects Memorandum to NHDHR. Laura Black with NHDHR said the Effects Memorandum should address the loss of the bridge type in the State and the commitments in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the Scammell Bridge. Ms. Black also asked about the New Castle-Rye Bridge Project. Ms. Reczek said the next Cultural Resources Coordination Meeting for the Hampton Harbor Bridge Project would also discuss the New Castle-Rye Bridge Project.

Mr. Murphy said the project team wants input on potential mitigation measures for the loss of the Neil R. Underwood Bridge. Ms. Edelmans then presented a list of potential mitigation measures including archival documentation of the bridge, the marketing of the bridge for another use, the placement of interpretive panels at the crossing, portable panels for educational use, a model of the bridge, a website dedicated to the bridge, and a short video on the bridge's history. Ms. Edelmans requested that attendees submit any potential mitigation measures to her. Mr. Trubey said that the maritime history should be addressed because that's why a bascule bridge was placed at the crossing. Ms. Moore said the newly reinstated Hampton Heritage Commission should have an opportunity to provide input on mitigation, as they will be the Town's representative for the project.

Ms. Black asked how the mitigation measures would address the specific bridge type and the broader issue of the historic bridge inventory. Ms. Reczek said she was reluctant to discuss the New Castle-Rye Bridge Project at the current meeting but that they would at the next meeting. Ms. Black said they will need to discuss the loss of the bridge, the loss of the bridge type, and the fact that the commitments in the Scammell MOA have not been met. She said there could be mitigation measures that also address other historic bridges in the state such as New Castle-Rye.

Ms. Moore asked what the impacts of the project would be on commercial enterprises. She said if the work is done off-season it may not be much of an issue. An attendee suggested the use of signs and radio spots to notify people that businesses remain open. Ms. Reczek said the Port Authority was not planning on renewing leases for some of the businesses in the northwest quadrant. Available parking signs would be posted if the businesses are open. Ms. Moore said there is a restaurant open year-round in the strip mall near Smith and Gilmore Deep Sea Fishing where they sell fishing boat tour tickets.

Ms. Moore then asked if the pump house north of the bridge would be repaired or removed. Mr. Murphy said it would be removed. Kate Bashline asked if there were any hazardous materials in the building. Ms. Moore said the Hampton Historical Society looked at this at one point. Ms. Edelmans said the project team examined the pump house and determined it was not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Moore said the Hampton Historical Society concurred with this finding.

Ms. Reczek said the next steps would be to update the Effects Tables and draft the Effects Memorandum; to revisit the New Castle-Rye Bridge Project; and to be ready to discuss both projects at the next Cultural Resources Coordination Meeting. She said a PAC meeting is scheduled for April 1st and that they hoped to have a public information meeting within two weeks of the PAC meeting. She said they were looking into holding a virtual meeting through the cable networks if virus containment was an issue.

Troy 40370 (non-federal)

Participants: Steve Halloran, Zachary Zavalianos, Jacobs; Rebecca Martin, Phil Brogan, Loretta Doughty, Mike Mozer, NHDOT

Initial consultation on the proposed rehabilitation or replacement of Bridge 089/114 over South Branch Ashuelot River. The goal of the meeting is to discuss potential impacts.

Steve Halloran presented an introduction and project overview for the bridge site. The project involves the rehabilitation or replacement of a NH Red List bridge that carries NH Route 12 over the South Branch Ashuelot River, in Troy, NH near Troy's northern border. The project purpose is to improve public safety and remove the bridge from the State Bridge Red List. The need for this project was explained to be the continuing advancement of deterioration of the bridge structure. The project is in the study phase exploring options and alternatives for either rehabilitation or replacement. There is no FHWA funding for this project, but a wetland permit will be needed, so ACOE is the lead federal agency.

The current bridge is a single span concrete rigid frame structure built in 1941 and rehabilitated in 1977. The bridge crosses the South Branch Ashuelot River with a clear span of 32'-0". The bridge supports a northbound and southbound traffic lane for NH Route 12 with no sidewalks. Project impacts are anticipated to be primarily within the Right-of-Way.

The project schedule was presented. The project is currently in Study Phase, with a Preliminary Public Information meeting to be held on April 23, 2020. *[Note – subsequent to the Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting, this Public Information meeting was postponed due to the COVID-19 public gathering restrictions.]* Parties contacted for solicitation of initial input include the Troy Board of Selectmen, Troy Department of Public Works, Troy Town Administrator, Troy Fire Department, Troy Planning Board, Troy Historical Society, NH Land and Community Heritage Investment Program, and NH Office of Strategic Initiatives. No responses have been received to date. Currently, the bridge rehabilitation study is being completed. The next step in the project design will be the Type, Size and Location study which will determine which option to advance to preliminary design. Preliminary and final design to be completed in 2021. Advertising for construction is scheduled for January 2023.

Zachary Zavalianos presented an overview of the cultural resources near the project area. Although EMMIT shows the bridge within the Forristall Historic District, the bridge is actually just outside of the northern boundary of the District according to original mapping documents from the Historic District Inventory Form. The subject bridge is within the APE and is considered "Not Eligible" due to loss of integrity. Laura Black commented that the Historic Bridge Inventory confirms that the bridge is not eligible. Troy Blanket Mills Picker House (TRO0207) at the Northeast corner of the bridge is not eligible for the national register. The Frank B. Forristall House (TRO0208) at the Southwest corner of the bridge is considered eligible for the national register. The Hornichak House (TRO0209) at the Southeast corner of the bridge is considered not eligible due to age. The rail trail bridge (TRO0302) upstream from the bridge is considered not eligible for the national register, but the Cheshire Rail Road is assumed to be eligible for the National Register. The rail trail bridge could be a contributing element. [See below for clarification regarding eligibility status of properties.]

A Phase IA Sensitivity Assessment identified six archaeologically sensitive areas within the project area. A Phase IB intensive archaeological investigation of all sensitivity areas is recommended. NHDHR has concurred with this recommendation.

Rehabilitation and Replacement alternatives being considered were presented supported by concept drawings and site photos as follows:

Rehabilitation: The rehabilitation option consists of a full deck replacement while retaining the existing frame legs and wingwalls. This rehabilitation concept is similar to what was constructed at the NH12 bridge a short distance to the north.

Replacement: Full replacement options would consist of a pre-fabricated superstructure with an increased span length with new abutments constructed behind existing. The overall bridge width would be increased by 3'-6".

Maintenance of Traffic options include a temporary bridge to the East/West of the Bridge, or a temporary bridge adjacent to the rail trail pedestrian bridge.

Avoidance/minimization of impacts include limiting construction within the right-of-way, maintaining existing roadway profile, and minimizing any changes in footprint of the final bridge structure.

Concerns/Comments:

L. Black noted that the bridge was evaluated as part of historic bridge inventory, and it is not eligible for the historic register. L. Black also noted the Cheshire Railroad is a significant engineering resource, and the stone abutments of the rail trail bridge are important. If the abutments are used for a temporary bridge, impacts to the assumed eligible Cheshire Railroad Historic District will need to be considered. The Franklin B Forristall House is not individually eligible, but is a contributing resource to the Forristall Historic District, so potential project impacts should be considered.

L. Black commented that a lot of the inventories referenced during the presentation are old and should be reviewed if impacts are proposed to these previously reviewed resources.

S. Halloran clarified that temporary abutments would be behind the existing stone abutments for the rail trail bridge, so there would be no impacts.

L. Black stated that the Hornichack House may need to be inventoried if there are impacts. L. Black asked if there would be any impacts to the Hornichack property, specifically the stone wall.

S. Halloran replied that no impacts will be made to the stone wall. Any work on Old Keene Road will be mainly for maintenance of traffic around bridge site.

L. Black replied that, as long as there are no impacts proposed, an inventory update to the Hornichack property is not necessary. J. Edlmann added that may need to be revisited if impact conditions change as the design progresses.

Rebecca Martin inquired how the Frank B. Forristall property would be affected. S. Halloran discussed MOT Alternative 3, which would intersect the end of a driveway and possibly some trees adjacent to the driveway on this property.

J. Edlmann stated that as the design progresses, another cultural resource meeting will need to be held to discuss the impacts of the preferred alternative.

D. Trubey confirmed that a Phase IB archaeological investigation should be carried out for this project.

S. Halloran asked about resubmitting the RPR form. J. Edelmann responded to update the RPR with additional information that describes impacts to the Historic District or Railroad. L. Black added to include the front page of the RPR to aid in tracking of the project at DHR.

J. Edelmann indicated that additional project information submitted would be reviewed for determination of any adverse effects, which would then lead to an Effect Memorandum.

Troy 40371, X-A004(374)

Participants: Steve Halloran, Zachary Zavalianos, Jacobs; Rebecca Martin, Phil Brogan, Loretta Doughty, Mike Mozer, NHDOT

Initial consultation on the proposed rehabilitation or replacement of bridge 096/091 NH 12 over the Cheshire Rail Trail (NHRR, ABD). The goal of the meeting is to discuss potential impacts.

Steve Halloran presented an introduction and project overview for this bridge site. The project site involves the rehabilitation or replacement of a NH Red List bridge that carries NH Route 12 over the abandoned NH Cheshire Railroad corridor, which is currently the Cheshire Rail Trail, in Troy, NH just north of the town common. The project purpose is improved public safety and removal of the bridge from the State Bridge Red List. The need for this project was explained to be the continuing advancement of deterioration of the bridge structure. The project is in the study phase exploring options and alternatives for either rehabilitation or replacement. This project does have FHWA funding.

The current bridge is a two-span structure with a concrete deck supported by steel beams on stone masonry abutments and a concrete pier. The bridge was built in 1957 and incorporated modifications to stone abutments which were part of a previous bridge. The bridge crosses the Cheshire Rail Trail on a severe skew with a main span of 38'-6" and a second span of 24'-0". The bridge supports a northbound and southbound traffic lane for NH Route 12 and a sidewalk on each side.

The project schedule was presented. The project is currently in Study Phase, with a Preliminary Public Information meeting to be held on April 23, 2020. *[Note – subsequent to the Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting, this Public Information meeting was postponed due to the COVID-19 public gathering restrictions.]* Parties contacted for solicitation of initial input include the Troy Board of Selectmen, Troy Department of Public Works, Troy Town Administrator, Troy Fire Department, Troy Planning Board, Troy Historical Society, NH Land and Community Heritage Investment Program, and NH Office of Strategic Initiatives. Currently, the bridge rehabilitation study is being completed. The next step in the project design will be the Type, Size and Location study which will determine which option to advance to preliminary design. Preliminary and final design are scheduled to be completed in 2021. Advertising for construction is scheduled for January 2023.

Zachary Zavalianos presented an overview of the cultural resources near the project area. The bridge is within two historic areas: Troy Village Historic District (TRO-00TV), which is eligible for the National Register and the Cheshire Railroad (ZMT-0CRR), which is assumed to be eligible for the National Register. The bridge itself was evaluated and determined "Not Eligible" individually for the National Historic Register (DOE 12/18/1996), but the bridge is a contributing resource within the Troy Village Historic District and the Cheshire Railroad historic district. The bridge's granite abutments date to an 1848 bridge, which was replaced by the current bridge in 1957. The Kendall/Baker House (TRO0182) at the Southeast corner of the bridge is a contributing element to the Troy Village Historic District. 1 Central Square (TRO0075A) at the Southwest corner of the

bridge is contributing to the Troy Village Historic District. Railroad House (TRO0185) at the Northeast corner of the bridge is a contributing element to the Troy Village Historic District. Hawkins/Bemis/Burpee House (TRO0183) at the Northwest corner of the bridge is a contributing element to the Troy Village Historic District.

A Phase IA Sensitivity Assessment identified that the impact of the project intersects areas that tend to lack significant archaeological features and concluded with a recommendation of no further survey required. NHDHR has concurred with this recommendation.

Rehabilitation and Replacement alternatives being considered were presented supported by concept drawings and site photos as follows:

Rehabilitation: The rehabilitation option consists of a full concrete deck replacement, widening of the sidewalks, updating bridge rails, and cleaning and painting the steel stringers. This alternative would be achieved through staged construction.

Replacement: Two options for replacement are being studied. The first option consists of a new concrete deck/steel beam superstructure supported either on rehabilitated existing abutments, or new abutments.

The second replacement option includes construction of a precast concrete arch structure within the main span envelope and below the existing bridge, minimizing impact to NH Route 12 traffic during construction. This option would eliminate the shorter existing span 2, with the current short span backfilled between the existing north abutment and new arch. Variations of this option are being explored relative to vertical clearance beneath the arch and traffic impacts.

Maintenance of Traffic options include phased construction with one lane, two-way alternating traffic on NH Route 12, or phased construction with Northbound traffic on NH Route 12 and Southbound traffic diverted onto Prospect Street.

Avoidance/minimization of impacts include limiting construction within the right-of-way, maintaining existing roadway profile, and minimizing any changes in footprint of the final bridge structure.

Concerns/Comments:

J. Edelmann stated that the bridge is not individually eligible but is a contributing resource in the historic district. Any impacts will be on the district.

J. Edelmann asked if there is anyone associated/interested in the Cheshire Rail Line who should be notified about the project. Reference was made to the stone arch in Keene.

L. Doughty questioned that although the bridge is not eligible, it is a contributing resource. What is the contributing resource element?

J. Edelmann stated that the stone work on the abutments are most likely the contributing element.

L. Black recommended to look at how buildings relate to one another, road patterns, green space, and water management within a historic district as opposed to looking at individual elements/properties. She also commented that as the design progresses the design team should try to minimize physical impacts.

R. Crickard stated that there will be 4(f) implications since this is a federal project. Is the trail a recreational resource?

D. Trubey answered that some of the trail is a recognized resource, but not all.

R. Crickard advised to confirm if the rail trail is a recognized recreational resource.

S. Halloran inquired about next steps as the project progresses.

J. Edelmann recommended to continue progressing the project to a recommended alternative. Once a recommended alternative is reached, submit additional information through the RPR. Another cultural resource meeting will be held to discuss any potential impacts.

L. Black recommended to complete two Effects Tables to help work through impacts on resources, with 1 table for the Cheshire Railroad and 1 table for the Troy Historic District.

Laconia 40656

Participants: Chris Fournier, J. Poulin, HEB; Lynne Monroe, Preservation Company; Ron Crickard, Ron Kleiner, NHDOT

Jay Poulin (HEB Engineers, Inc.) and Lynne Monroe (Preservation Company) represented the City of Laconia in the review of the project. The projects includes the replacement of the historic 1912 Court Street Bridge (#113/036) over Durkee Brook in Laconia, NH. The goal of the meeting was to identify the appropriate mitigation for the removal of the historic bridge. The project is being administered through the State Aid Bridge program.

J. Poulin reviewed general project details with the group through a brief PowerPoint slide deck that included photos, background details of the overall Court Street roadway reconstruction project, bridge replacement alternatives studies, and discussion of mitigation details. J. Poulin noted the City's preferred mitigation approach was to develop and implement a maintenance procedure, which is identified in the City's Bridge Management Plan for all 13 of Laconia's municipally-owned bridges.

Laura Black noted there is no need to solely attribute NHDHR regarding the utilization of the Historic Bridge Inventory to determine the bridge is eligible for the National Register as there is concurrence amongst the different reviewing agencies.

During review of the alternatives studied, L. Black questioned why the Rehabilitation option is not feasible. J. Poulin, along with support from Jill Edelmann and Ron Kleiner, confirmed rehabilitation of this type of bridge construction is not a practical option due to concrete delamination and deterioration of steel that can't be fixed. J. Poulin reviewed the selected alternative which includes replacement "over-the-top" of the existing bridge. This option includes a new 30'-span over the existing 15'-wide channel which allows for accelerated construction, minimizes wetland impacts, retains existing stone abutments & channel and requires minimal ground disturbance.

L. Black questioned whether the old, potentially historic residential properties directly adjacent to the bridge would be impacted by driving of foundation piles or construction in general. J. Poulin noted vibration monitoring can be included in the project to help mitigate this concern. Laura Black noted this should happen. L. Black suggested the City reach out to these property owners prior to construction and provide a contact should they have any concerns. Laura Black suggested a clear protocol be established for any issues.

During review of the preferred mitigation approach of a maintenance procedure, there were several questions and extended discussions. L. Black and Rick Kristoff were generally concerned about the accountability and monitoring of this mitigation approach. Questions such as "has any other community done this for mitigation" and "who and how are we going to confirm this mitigation is happening". J. Poulin reminded the group about

the tight schedule relative to construction which then pivoted the discussions to a mitigation approach that would likely require less coordination and time to finalize. The focus then turned to an educational approach highlighting the City's historical bridges. All in attendance felt an educational "brochure" to be included on the City's website would meet the objective of appropriate mitigation that could be coordinated within the tight project schedule which includes construction in 2020. The group liked the idea of a map with highlights of the historical bridges which could act as a walking guide with informational details relative to the bridges. J. Poulin to confirm approach is amenable with City. If so, next steps are to revise the Section 106 Cultural Resources Effect Memo and coordinating with the Lead Federal Agency (USACOE) for final approval.

L. Black noted some comments on the Effects Table and L. Monroe agreed to revise and submit back to Sheila Charles.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edlmann, Cultural Resources